

GENERAL LIBRARY
OCT 16 1912

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VI

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 12, 1912

No. 2

In the current number of *The American Journal of Philology*, under Brief Mention, Professor Gildersleeve deals with a variety of interesting topics. He begins with a brief summary of a monograph by Dr. Samuel Lee Wolff, entitled *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (Columbia University Press). The book discusses romances by Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius, and Longus, and the influence of these romances on English prose literature; the author concludes that "Heliodorus and Longus are respectively secondary and primary sources of Shakespeare", that "Lyly's *Euphues* probably occupies a place in a long tradition that goes back to Greek Romance", and, finally, that "both Sidney and Greene were steeped in the matter and the style of Greek fiction, and Sidney went so far as to remodel his *Arcadia* after the pattern of Heliodorus' narrative". Professor Gildersleeve proceeds to say "some of the obvious things" about this whole line of research, this effort to show the debt of the moderns to their predecessors (a theme on which such excellent general observations were made by Professor Sherman in his article, *English and the Latin Question*, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5, 201-203, 209-213.) Some of Professor Gildersleeve's remarks remind me of one of my own hobbies, the question of the originality of Latin literature.

The whole thing is a tradition from the days of the Alexandrian *grammatici*; and the fragments thereof remain in the scholia. Our modern methods are more exact, more persistent, and there are few of our leaders who dare say with Wilamowitz that like Plato they care more for the λόγος than for οἱ λόγοι. In periods of creative activity your healthy ancient, yes, your healthy modern, troubled himself little about sources, about the charge of plagiarism. These periods over, the packs of Alexandrian scholars, of modern scholars, have busied themselves in nosing out the origin of this fancy and that fancy, this and that story. No man is supposed to have a brook of his own; everybody is supposed to have drawn from the tank of some other man, as Coleridge puts it. What would Shakespeare have cared about all the proofs of his indebtedness? Molière snapped his fingers at those who made him out to be under heavy obligations to Spain. And, to cite a very modern instance, Charles Reade was notoriously a thief of the world. "The pedigree of honey", sings the New England Sappho, "Does not concern the bee". Most assuredly it did not concern the Matinian bee. It did not concern Vergil. The Roman poets rifled Greek prose as well as Greek poetry. Every fresh find of Greek lyric fragments contributes to the sources of Horace. But as has been well said: If Alkaios and the

rest of the nine lyric poets were to rise from the dead, Horace would still be Horace.

Lest, in my zeal for my own views, I convey a false impression of Professor Gildersleeve's attitude on a certain kind of research, I add that he had emphasized the importance of Dr. Wolff's work for the student of English literature; he had also said: "In my world of dreams there lives and moves a Brief History of Greek Literature in which the space allotted to each author is measured by the rôle he has played in the literary annals of the English tongue".

In view of the appearance in the last number of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* of Professor Scribner's review of two books dealing primarily with the modern Greeks, our readers will be interested in Professor Gildersleeve's remarks on two books of kindred nature. Of these, one, Mr. Horton's *In Argolis*, was published some years ago; the other, *Tales of a Greek Island*, by a Greek woman, Mrs. Dragoumis, is new (Houghton Mifflin Company). Mr. Horton's book Professor Gildersleeve read afresh as "just the prophylactic I needed to keep me from falling under the Circean spell of Mrs. Dragoumis". But under that spell he fell, nevertheless; witness his interesting comparison and contrast of the two books, the one written by "a clear-eyed American who was thoroughly familiar with the life he was describing", the other by "a native woman of refinement".

... when the American man and the Greek woman turn the fair side outward, they are rivals in poetical expression. If you want matter of fact, you must turn to such a writer as Mr. Zimmern, who stands no nonsense about flowers and fruits. Greece, he says after Mr. Myres, is a jamless world; and nothing could present a sharper contrast than Mr. Horton's description of the asphodel and Mr. Zimmern's note on the same vegetable growth. Mr. Horton says of it: "A stately plant, as befits the symbol of death; for it stands up tall and straight with stalks that branch out symmetrically from the main stem. The plain where it grows seems a great table, set with many silver candelabra". Silver candelabra, forsooth! Here is what Mr. Zimmern says of the asphodel: "The asphodel is a sort of overgrown hyacinth, and is one of the commonest scrub flowers. To the ordinary Greek farmer the name conveyed nothing of the romance which our poets have woven round it" (*Greek Commonwealth*, p. 43). The fact is, wherever fancy comes in, fact suffers—perhaps ought to suffer. Zola's description of Rome is said to be marvellously exact in view of his short sojourn. But it suited him to say that there were no bells in Rome, "those friends of the humble", nothing but domes; whereas Frederic Har-

riason complains that the "air is heavy with the jangle of incessant belfries".

After remarking that the charm of Mrs. Dragoumis's book "lies not only in the personality it reveals, but also in the vivid description of the scenery, the immediate vision she gives of the home life of the Poriotas, the sharp individuality of the characters", Professor Gildersleeve writes as follows:

I have no qualms of conscience about the space I have given to Mr. Horton and yielded to Mrs. Dragoumis. Their books enter directly into the studies of the Hellenist. There is a constant increase in the number of scholars who make themselves personally acquainted with the land and the people of Hellas, with the . . . languages that are spoken on the sacred soil of Greece; and much to the advantage of those who are chiefly concerned with the life of the classical past. Books like Mr. Grundy's *Thucydides and the History of his Age*, like Mr. Zimmern's *Greek Commonwealth* have a vitality that comes from the sky and the land of Hellas. In my youth a man who knew the Greek of the Nineteenth Century was a rarity and there were few among my German teachers who could speak of Greece from actual vision. . . . Now with the recent facilities of travel every other tourist can talk of Athens, Epidaurus, Olympia. But as I recall my own visit, as I read the glowing descriptions of Mr. Horton and Mrs. Dragoumis I cannot suppress a word in favor of the Greece of our dreams, the Greece that was before the days of the tribe of Thomas Cook and Son. The changes in the land of Greece may, it is true, have gone on in some respects along the lines of classical times. Mountain and watercourse may enable us to follow the study of the ancient battlefields, but in order to reproduce the Greece of our boyhood, we must do as Méryon did, who in his etchings simply thought away much of the Paris of his times, and so in the vision of the actual Greece we must think away much that fills the eye and charms the eye. . . . The sea is there and the olive-trees are there, and there is a distinct gain in the sight of the Greek sea, and in contemplating the Greek olive-tree. But there were no oranges and lemons in the old days—to say nothing of the exotic eucalyptus. The people—delightful as some of them are—do not answer to the Greek type as we know it from the monuments. The conquest of the black over the blond which is going on everywhere is complete. It has been contended that even in antiquity the blond beauty was emphasized because of its rarity. I have read and heard that there are villages in odd corners of Greece where the blond type survives, but I was a little surprised at Mr. Horton's "towheaded" urchins. I should never have used the adjective of the school-boys I saw assembled in Sparta. When as boys we were taught the history of the Persian War, we were told that it embodied the eternal conflict between Orient and Occident, and despite all that one reads in Curtius about the nearness of Greece to Asia Minor, its practical remoteness from Italy, it is hard to realize the orientalism of Greece. There is no touch of orientalism in the Greece that we learned at school. The Orient is with us at every turn in the Greece that now is. Greece is not in Europe, and in some aspects the ineffable Greek is nearer to the unspeakable Turk than we are to either. The kingdom of Hellas is a spiritual kingdom.

C. K.

PLAUTUS AS AN ACTING DRAMATIST¹

The collegian thumbing the pages of Plautus for the first time is doubtless much diverted by the quips and cranks of the knavish slave, the complaints of love-sick youth, the austere moralizing of old age, the impotent rage of the baffled pander, and the fruitless growlings of the hungry parasite's belly. As he delves deeper he is further amused, perhaps astonished, at finding his new-found friends in other plays, clothed in different names to be sure and supplied with a fresh stock of jests, but still engaged in the frustration of villainous panders, the cheating of harsh papas, until all ends with virtue triumphant in the establishment of the undoubted respectability of a hitherto somewhat dubious female character. The reader's astonishment waxes as he observes further the close correspondence of dialogue, situation and dramatic machinery. He is bewildered by the innumerable asides of unseen listeners, the recurrence of soliloquy and familiar address of the audience, while every once in so often a slave, bent on finding someone who is actually under his nose, careens wildly cross stage or rouses the echoes by unmerciful battering of doors, meanwhile unburdening himself solus with great gusto. And all this is dished up with a sauce of humor often too racy and piquant for our delicate twentieth-century palate.

Our putative student, on further study, is met by the enthusiastic comments of German critics. He is greeted with elaborate analyses of plot and character; he is informed that he is reading 'Meisterwerke' in the field of comic drama. He searches in vain for an explanation of the gentle foibles of our author. In perplexity he asks himself 'What manner of drama is this? Is it comedy farce, opera bouffe or mere buffoonery? How was it done? What was the technique of acting? Where are the stage directions?'

We may now discard our hypothetical student. The purpose of our little investigation sums itself up in the two questions—'What manner of drama is this?' and 'How was it done?' As regards the first question the opinions of divers eminent critics lead us into a maze of contradiction. Körting, in his *Geschichte des griechischen und römischen Theaters*, informs us quite properly that it "was not comedy in the highest, in the aesthetic sense of the word, but merely entertainment". So far, so good. But he adds "we are requested to be convinced that everything is happening in a perfectly natural manner"! In other words, Mr. Körting refuses to accept the value that he himself stamps upon the work.

Wilhelm Schlegel (*History of the Drama*) characterizes Plautus as inclining "to the farcical, to overwrought and often disgusting drollery".

¹ This paper was read before The Classical Association of the Atlantic States at its Sixth Annual Meeting, at Philadelphia, May 4, 1912.

Lorenz, on the contrary (Introduction to the *Mostellaria* and the *Pseudolus*), carried away by the unhealthy enthusiasm of monomania, indulges in elaborate dissections of character and motive springing from his avowed belief that he is dealing with masterpieces of dramatic diction and technique.

Naudet (*Théâtre de Plaute*) actually ascribes to our poet a high moral purpose.

Mommsen comes nearer the truth when he declares that in Roman comedy "persons and incidents seem capriciously or carelessly shuffled as in a game of cards; in the original <Greek> a picture from life, it became in the reproduction a caricature".

From this illustrative portion of a mass of heterogeneous criticism we glean at least the important fact that Plautus is lauded or condemned for his conformity or non-conformity to some definite ideal or standard of comic drama situate in the critic's mind. We must seriously ask how far a gross injustice has been committed in criticising him for what he does not pretend to be. Seizing upon Körting's phrase that nothing further than amusement lay within the scope of the poet of *palliatæ*, we can surely posit that at least great license must be allowed the pen which aims simply to raise a laugh. We do not fulminate against a treatise on the theory of numbers because it lacks humor. We do not condemn a vaudeville skit for not conforming to the Aristotelian code of dramatic technique. If, then, we can establish that Plautus intended his adapted dramas merely as a rack on which to hang witticisms, merely as a vehicle for laugh-provoking sallies and situations, we have at once Plautus as he pretended to be and in large measure the answer to our first question, "What manner of drama is this?"

I say only "in large measure" because it is part of my endeavor to settle accurately the position of our author in the dramatic scale. In doing this our view-point must of necessity be tinged with modernity. If, then, we run the gamut of the dramatic scale we observe that as we descend from the higher forms to the lower the license allowed author and actor increases immeasurably. Some conventions we accept without question even in the highest types of drama. We do not cavil at the missing side of the room, nor at the communication of the contents of a letter written on the stage to the atmosphere, nor at the blatant stage-whisper. As we go down the dramatic scale, through light comedy and broad farce, these conventions multiply rapidly. When we reach musical comedy and vaudeville, all thought of verisimilitude is abandoned, the actors bandy jokes with the audience, and we ask but to laugh. If, then, we can place Plautus toward the bottom of the scale, we relieve him of much responsibility as a technical dramatist. To determine this, we must consider his methods of producing his effects and how far the audience and the acting

contributed to them. We are now encroaching insensibly on the grounds of our second leading question—"How was it done?"

First, the audience. We all know them. A motley throng, tumbling into the theater or enclosure in holiday spirit, squabbling for places, giving vent to cat-calls, voicing their approval or disapproval in no uncertain terms. To win the favor of such an audience, what methods were necessary? slap-sticks, horse-play, broad, slashing, swashbuckling, humor, thick colors daubed on with lavish brush!

To accomplish this, the playwright depended on the actor no less than on himself. When we consider the ancient actor it is astonishing how little information we possess as to his stage methods. We know that his education was very elaborate and that the study of gesticulation was the most essential branch of his training. Indeed, it is highly probable that Roscius adopted the mask to subordinate the hardly-to-be-distinguished play of feature and to emphasize the importance of gesture. The servile status of the ancient actor is likewise to a certain extent an index to his energy. That much favor, often freedom, could be won by success, would spur him on to greater efforts.

If, then, the scenic and the histrionic were the vital elements to the Roman audience, if the actor was equipped by nature and training for a performance vivid with liveliness of action and gesticulation, we are prepared to establish that Plautus's sole aim was to feed the popular hunger for amusement. While leaving much of his Greek originals practically untouched, he considered them in effect but a medium for the provocation of popular laughter. His actors went before the public, slap-stick in hand, aided by natural liveliness of grimace and gesture, and acted with the extreme of dash and vigor, with the utmost verve, unction and abandon. If we succeed in establishing this, we relegate *palliatæ* to the plane of broad farce, where verisimilitude to life becomes unnecessary, where the poet may stick at nothing to coerce laughter, where all the absurd conventions of Plautine drama cease to be absurd, vanish into thin air and become unamenable to literary criticism, inasmuch as they are only part of the whole laugh-compelling scheme. Certain it is that Plautus's dramatic machinery loses much in effectiveness unless interpreted in this spirit.

What, then, are the salient features which make the plays of Plautus what they are? I should make bold to catalogue them as follows: first, bombast and mock-heroics; secondly, horse-play and slap-sticks; thirdly, burlesque, farce, extravagance of situation and dialogue; fourthly, asides, soliloquies, direct address of the audience; fifthly, pointless badinage, padded and interpolated scenes dissociated from the main action; sixthly, stock plots, character and dialogue; seventhly, careless composition, inconsistent character drawing.

It will now be my aim to illustrate these characteristics by typical passages, in the course of which I shall endeavor to insert such stage-directions as would indicate how the most telling effects could be produced.

(1) Bombast and mock-heroics. It is a little difficult to sublimate this entirely from burlesque, but an instance of what I mean may be seen in the opening lines of the Miles. The vainglorious Pyrgopolinices, with many a sweep and strut, addresses his attendants, who are probably staggering under the weight of an enormous shield: 'Have a care that the effulgence of my shield be brighter than e'er the sun's rays in a cloudless sky; when the time for action comes and the battle's on I intend it shall dazzle the eyesight of m' foes (patting his sword). Verily I would condole with this my sword, lest he lament and be cast down in spirit, forasmuch as now full long hath he hung idle by my side, thirsting, poor lad, to meet his fellow mongst the foe'.

The same motif of course recurs frequently in the Miles. I could amplify at will, but lack of time prevents my citing more than one or two typical examples of each of my points.

In line with the above passage a simulation of the military is a favorite device. The cunning Pseudolus at times addresses the audience in blustering tones and with grandiose gesture with talk of siege and armies. In the Miles again a passage in like vein occurs which Professor West thinks was lugged in by the ears to rouse the populace into demanding that Scipio be at once despatched to Africa.

(2) By the second heading—horse-play and slapsticks—I mean to imply what can in nowise be so clearly defined as by 'rough-house'. For instance, the turbulent Euclio, in the Aulularia delivers bastings impartially to all the dramatis personae and winds up by driving the cooks and the music-girl pell-mell out of the house. Similarly in the Casina Chalinus routs Olympio and the lecherous Lysidamus. We may well imagine that such scenes were preceded by a fearful racket within the house and carried on with much howling and groaning from the victims, the effect probably heightened by tempestuous accompaniment of the clarinet.

In the free-fight in the Menaechmi, where the valiant Messenio aids his master in routing the Iorarii, we have a wealth of graphic detail in the lines themselves.

Messenio says: 'Now as for these rascals, I'll plant a crop of fists in their faces' (lays about him).

Men. 'I've got this fellow by the eye'.

Mes. 'Leave his face nought but the socket'. And further on—'Come, clear out! To everlasting perdition with you; that for you! (biff!). Take your reward for being the last to go! (bang!).

(3) Under the third head—burlesque, farce and extravagance of situation and dialogue—I mean to

include such conscious strivings for comic effect as are plainly exaggerated and hypernatural. For example, patent burlesque of tragedy appears in the Trinummus, when Charmides returns from abroad and says:

'To Neptune, ruler of the deep and puissant brother unto Jove and Nereus, do I in joy and gladness cry my praises and gratefully pronounce my gratitude, and to the briny waves, who held me in their power, yea, even my chattels and my very life, and from their realms restored me to the city of my birth' (etc., for a whole scene).

To tickle the palate of the groundlings this must have been delivered in burlesque with all the paraphernalia of the tragic style. When the versatile Pseudolus in like manner cries to Calidorus, 'Hail! Hail! Thee, thee, O mighty ruler, thee do I beseech who art lord over Pseudolus!' (etc.), Charinus remarks in a significant aside, 'The rascal's spouting like a tragedian'.

When Sosia, in the first scene of the Amphitruo, grandiloquently describes the battle between the Thebans and the Teleboans, he is parodying the Messenger of tragedy.

The extravagance of the love-sick swain is another fruitful source of caricature. Phaedromus, of the Curculio, accompanied by his slave, approaches milady's abode, and cries (with eyes rolled upward and hands clasped, in languishing accents)

'Shall I not take sweets to the sweet? What is culled by the toil of the busy bees to my own little honey?'

(Later on they advance to the lady's doorway, which Phaedromus sprinkles with wine):

Phaed. 'Come, drink, ye portals of pleasure, quaff and deign to be propitious unto me'.

Palinurus servos (addressing the door with mockery of Phaedromus's airs): 'Do you want some olives or sweet-meats or capers?'

Phaed. (continuing): 'Arouse your portress; hither send her unto me' (lavishes the wine).

Pal. (in great alarm, grasping his arm). 'You're spilling the wine! What's got hold of you?'

Phaed. 'Unhand me! (gently shakes himself loose). Lo! The temple of joys untold is opening. Did not the hinge creak? 'Tis charming'.

Pal. (turning aside in disgust). 'Why don't you give it a kiss?'

The impertinent slave provides the foil. Frequently another species of lover's extravagance is the lavishing of terms of endearment, such as we find in the Casina, where Olympio mocks the pretensions of Charinus, his rival for Casina's hand. At the opposite extreme, but exemplifying the same tendency, is the employment of copious abuse, as in the Persa, where Toxilus servos and Dordalus leno indulge in an exchange of Rabelaisian compliments, of almost too high a potency to quote here. This sort of profuse riot of words is of course characteristic

of the facile Plautine style. Another phase of it appears in the formidable Persian name which Sagaristio adopts in the Persa, when he is disguised as a Persian:

Dord. 'What's your name?'

Sag. 'Listen then and you shall hear: False-speakerus Girl-seller-son Much-o'-nothing-talk-son Money-gouge-out-son Talk-up-to-you-son Coin-wheel-out-son What-I-once-get-son Never-give-up-son—there you are!'

Dord. (with bulging eyes and gasping breath) 'Gosh! That's a variegated name of yours!'

Sag. (with a superior wave of the hand) 'It's the Persian fashion'.

When this feature which I label "extravagance" enters the situation, instead of the dialogue we have episodes such as the final scene of the Pseudolus, where the name character is irrelevantly introduced in a state of intoxication. We can scarcely doubt that such business was carried out with a wealth of ultra-graphic detail that brought copious guffaws from the populace.

Under the same general head of burlesque and extravagance we may consider the much-mooted question of scenes in which a character evidently in ungovernable haste finds time to indulge in exhaustive comments the while. This has usually been criticised as an incongruity, but consider for a moment how effective a laugh-provoking device it might become if the comic actor should make a violent pretence of running while scarcely stirring from the spot. We have all doubtless seen modern low-comedians make a 'hit' with the same piece of 'business'. For example, the following lines from the Curculio become potentially comic instead of unexplainably absurd if Curculio makes an energetic simulation of frenzied haste:

Curc. (enters) 'Make way for me, friends and strangers, while I execute my commission here. Run, all of you, scatter and clear the road! I'm in a hurry and I don't want to hurt anyone with my head, or elbow, or breast, or knee. . . . And there's none so rich as can stand in my way, . . . none so famous but down he goes off the sidewalk and stands on his head in the street'—(etc., for ten lines more). After he has found his master Phaedromus he is apparently so exhausted that he cries, 'Hold me up, please hold me up!' (wobbles and falls fainting into Phaedromus's arms).

Phaed. 'Get him a chair—quick!'

This type of fun-making becomes so common that Mercury parodies it by crying at the conclusion of a similar scene in the Amphitruo, 'For egad! I'd like to know why I, a God, shouldn't have as much right to threaten the rabble as a mere slave in the comedies!'

In the scene recently quoted, Curculio, after his violent exertions in search of his master, is for a time apparently unable to discover him, though he is on the stage all the time. Scenes of this type

are common and must likewise owe their comic effect to broad burlesque in the acting. The breadth of the Roman stage alone is not sufficient to reduce such scenes to the realm of probability. The actor must peer in every direction but the right one. So Curculio passes directly by Phaedromus without seeing him and turns back again, while saying,

'Is there anybody who can point out Phaedromus, my guardian angel, to me? The matter's very urgent. I must meet this man at once'.

Pal. (to Phaedromus) 'It's you he's looking for'.

Phaed. 'What do you say we speak to him? Hello Curculio, I want you'.

Curc. (stopping and again vainly looking around) 'Who's calling? Who's mentioning my name?'

Phaed. 'A man who wants to see you'.

Curc. (at last recognizing Phaedromus when almost on top of him) 'Ah! You don't want to see me any more than I want to see you'.

Strikingly similar scenes recur in the Mercator and the Epidicus.

The opportunity for a related species of farcical by-play is provided by the opening lines of the Persa, in which slaves, Toxilus and Sagaristio, stroll in from opposite sides alternately soliloquizing, but are apparently unable to distinguish each other's features. Suddenly, when rather close, they look up and peer at each other:

Tox. (shading his eyes with his hand). 'Who's standing over yonder?'

Sag. 'Who's this standing across there?'

Tox. 'Looks like Sagaristio'.

Sag. 'Tis surely my friend Toxilus'.

Tox. 'He's the man, all right'.

Sag. 'Tis he, I'm sure'.

Tox. 'I'll accost him'.

Sag. 'I'll address him'.

Tox. 'Sagaristio, the blessing of the gods upon you'.

Sag. 'Toxilus, the gods will grant all your desires. How are you?'

Tox. 'So, so'.

(To be continued).

WILTON W. BLANCKÉ.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

Selected Letters of Pliny. Edited by Hugh Macmaster Kingery. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company (1911). Pp. 242. \$90.

"Pliny's letters are read as a rule by sophomores or freshmen in college", says Professor Kingery in his preface, "and it is the aim in this little volume to offer the help experience has shown to be requisite". Naturally, then, the work is in no sense a critical edition. It presents a much larger amount of the text of Pliny than either of the two American editions which immediately preceded it. For collateral reading or for extended reading with a class, it will therefore prove of value.

Successive editions of selections have, to a large degree, determined a canon of the epistles which cannot be omitted from any text-book. In regard to these, the editor's choice is representative and satisfying. On the debatable ground outside of this modicum, however, there seems a superfluity of letters along the same lines, involving a recurrence of theme, which is out of place in a book of selections. For instance, 10.39 and 10.40 parallel, in general subject-matter, 10.37 and 10.38; 10.94 and 10.95 derive their interest from the mention of Suetonius, but Pliny's relations with Suetonius could be sufficiently discussed in connection with 1.18, 1.24, 5.10; 7.1, 7.16, and 7.30 could well be excised, for surely we have enough extracts to show us Pliny the prig and Pliny the pedant; 4.5, 6, 18, 26, 29 add little of moment; 10.41, 42, 61, 62, dealing with the proposed channel from the Bithynian lake to the sea, do not repay, in interest, the space they occupy.

These letters, then, might well have given place not only to fuller annotation, but to other letters, intrinsically more interesting and general favorites, such as 4.22 (the Junius Mauricus episode: the reply of this latter-day Cato to Nerva, *Nobiscum cenaret*, should win a place in any selection), and, for contrast, 4.25 (which displays the pusillanimity of a senate which would trifle away a restored prerogative, the secret ballot, by writing on the tablets *multa iocularia atque etiam foeda dictu*). The latter epistle would force the inclusion of 3.20. These letters would go far to explain the drift of Roman politics at this period and are important for the light they shed upon the impotence of the senatorial party of opposition, a party blind to the substantial blessings which imperial government had brought to the world at large. 10.65 and 10.66 (old friends for which many will look), concerning the *ἀπαιτοῦς* in Bithynia, which throw an illuminating side-light upon one of the stock plots of ancient comedy, and a custom which we are liable to associate primarily with an earlier day, I miss; so, too, 8.17, about the floods in the Tiber valley. But any selection is determined by the personal differential.

The amount of text which has been included has wrought havoc, however, in one direction: in many cases the annotation seems to have been determined by the limitations of space rather than by the demands of the text. There is a golden mean, *quae est inter nimium et parum* (between e.g., Mayor's editions and the Teubner texts), which this book has not attained. If philology has killed the Classics, it is not the kind which the editor omits. The legitimate opportunities for the instructor to range rather widely are here so great and so enticing that Pliny seems to be one of the authors who peculiarly invite full treatment in the notes. If the instructor is to have time for this, such matters might be pointed out in the notes as the development of the use of *domine*, 10.2.1, or the meaning of *olim*, 1.11.1, 'now for a long time', with which

the sophomore or the freshman will not be familiar. Its use here is characteristic of Silver Latin, since it denotes continuance from an earlier to a later point in time, and is thus the practical equivalent of *iam pridem* and *iam dudum*. Seneca actually inserts *iam* in Epp. 77.3, *olim iam nec perit quicquam*. Here, too, a cross-reference is in order to 8.9.1. Many points of Silver Latin the editor has ignored, e.g., the use of *imputare*, 6.20.20, 9.13.6 (for the Ciceronian *assignare*, *ascribere*), and the use of *ista* as equal to *haec*, 1.10.11.

At times this striving for brevity leaves both reference and meaning quite in the dark. In 10.17 B Pliny requests a *mentor*; in 10.18 Trajan tactfully refuses on the plea of inability to secure enough *mentores* for his own building operations; Pliny repeats a similar request in 10.37, which Trajan ignores, 10.38; and again in the interchange of letters 10.39 and 10.40, the Emperor denies his governor. There is not a word to explain what these vast improvements were. Again, on 10.33.1 there is no note to indicate the importance of the development and spread of Egyptian cults throughout the Hellenic and Graeco-Roman worlds. The idea of making 'Pliny his own interpreter' is subject, of necessity, to many limitations. At present, through archaeological sources and modern analytic method, we know more of the religious unrest, portrayed in the spread of Egyptian cults, than did Pliny himself. Hence a sentence or two drawn from the information at hand in such a work, for example, as Cumont's, would here be very illuminating. Further, on *ius trium liberorum*, occurring four times (2.13.8, 10.2.1, 10.94.2, 10.95.1), there is no note. Cross-reference and index direct to an original comment upon 2.7.5; but this epistle has not been included in the collection. *Relegatus*, 1.5.5, passes without notice. These instances are simply typical of the things one is not to look for in Professor Kingery's book.

Furthermore, the notes are uneven in regard to the amount of information they furnish to help the student arrive at the meaning of the text. For example, we find such notes as "*quid ageret* (3.16.4): 'how he was doing'. The same words might mean 'What he was doing'". There is much comment on the perfectly obvious: (9.13.14) "*inimicos*: 'personal enemies'"; (3.5.3) "*unus*: sc. *liber*", and just below, "*duo*: sc. *libri*"; (3.18.1) "*Cum . . . quod . . . fecissem*: 'when I had done this'"; and the advice endlessly given, "supply, *est, esse*", etc.

Other passages scanty comment or entire absence of comment leaves unexplained. Thus, *nescio an*, though spoken of in a single section of the Introduction, receives no mention in the Notes. The assistance afforded on *cuius compos*, 1.12.8, on *mancipatum*, 4.2.2, on *rescripto*, 10.2.1 and many more cruxes, does not really explain. On 2.11.10 we read: "*cetera*: acc., 'on other accounts, and especially in the full attendance of senators'". It

has been suggested that this should be explained rather as an ablative. The words coördinated by *cum . . . tum* are *cetera* and *senatorum*, the attributives of *frequentia*. Hence the translation should be, 'throngs of people of all kinds and, especially, senators'. To say that 10.33 deals with a "proposal to form a guild or labor union" is a sacrifice of accuracy to a faint coloring of modernity: what Pliny actually wanted to do was to form a volunteer fire department of not more than one hundred and fifty *fabri*.

As to the *amount* of translation in the notes the editor has shown excellent judgment. He has skillfully gauged the student's capacity. Our aim is that a student should acquire the ability to translate the norm, not the extremely difficult. The average student, if such assistance is not given, will be inclined not to thumb the Lewis and Short for the meaning of a special passage, but will reach his goal by a shorter route. Again, the efficiency of the notes for class-room work is not impaired by subtleties or over-refinement of interpretation. Indeed the great value of the commentary rests just here, in furnishing legitimate help in translating and in being marred by no far-fetched hermeneutic.

The introduction suffers from the same cause as the commentary, undue compression. The student is left to get his ideas of Silver Latin and of Pliny's style, vocabulary and syntax, for example, from little over a page and a half of large-print descriptive matter here and from disconnected notes in the body of the book. The narrow bounds leave no space for more than an annalist's account of Pliny's life. There is no room to create 'atmosphere' by a descriptive treatment. In short, I distrust those little volumes which profess to "offer the help which experience has shown to be requisite". The saving remnant which studies Latin beyond the required courses will find a scholarly book, with a reasonably long and detailed introduction and material in notes and references beyond the mere minimum need, much more useful.

With all mechanical devices for student convenience the book is well equipped. It contains a table of contents, separate indices of subjects, of proper names, of text and notes, a chronological table and topical headings in the introduction in heavy type. The commentary is on the same page with the text, an arrangement undeniably sound if the student's copy is not used in the class room. The printing is good and the volume is attractive. I have noticed a few misprints, particularly in Greek words.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. WILLIAM STUART MESSER.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The General Meetings of the American Philological Association, The Archaeological Institute of America and the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis will be held jointly in the city of Wash-

ington, Friday, Saturday, Monday and Tuesday, December 27, 28, 30, 31, 1912. The programme is in charge of a joint committee consisting of two representatives each of the Association, the Institute and the Society, who at a recent meeting unanimously adopted the outline as here announced.

The Washington Society of the Institute will be the host with the coöperation of the Smithsonian Institution and the Georgetown, George Washington and Catholic Universities. The exercises will be held chiefly in the New Building of the National Museum, Smithsonian Institution. The Raleigh Hotel, Pennsylvania Avenue and 12th Streets, will be headquarters. Reasonable rates, European and American, can be obtained also at the Ebbitt or the Johnson, and at good boarding houses.

Joint sessions will be held on Friday and Monday evenings. On Saturday evening a general reception will be given by the Washington Society to members and visitors. On Saturday morning meetings will be held in four sections, designated respectively: Semitic and Biblical, Classical Philology, Mediaeval and Renaissance, and American Archaeology. Sessions for papers will be held by the Association Friday and Saturday afternoons and Monday morning and afternoon; by the Institute Friday and Saturday afternoons and Monday morning, and by the Society Friday morning and afternoon and Saturday afternoon. The meeting on Saturday afternoon may be a joint session of the Association and the Institute. Committee meetings have been planned so as not to conflict with the sessions for papers.

The Annual Meeting of the Council of the Institute will be held on Tuesday morning and afternoon, December 31, in the Octagon, in the drawing room adjacent to the Office of the Institute.

Inquiries or communications in regard to the programme or arrangements should be addressed to Frank Gardner Moore, Secretary of the American Philological Association, Columbia University, N. Y., or Mitchell Carroll, General Secretary of the Archaeological Institute, the Octagon, Washington, D. C., or James A. Montgomery, Secretary of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 6808 Green Street, Germantown, Pa.

Pursuant to Section 467 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, the result of a law passed by Congress on August 24, 1912, I have filed, on behalf of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, with the Postmaster of New York City, two copies of a sworn statement, certifying that the Editor of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is Gonzalez Lodge; the Managing Editor and the Business Manager, Charles Knapp; the Publisher and the Owner, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. The sworn statement also gave the information about the times of publication of the paper which appears regularly on the last page of each issue.

C. K.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October 1, to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 119th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GEORGE L. LUDON, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

Just Published

A FIRST LATIN READER

By H. C. NUTTING, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Latin,
University of California.

60 cents

Intended, like the author's Latin Primer, for upper grammar grade beginners. Offers 140 interesting lessons, illustrated, drawn largely from early American history, and supplied with notes and vocabulary.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

The Back Volumes of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

MAY BE SECURED
BY WRITING TO

Professor Charles Knapp
Barnard College, NEW YORK CITY

A Limited Number of Sets remains.
Price \$1.00 Per Volume.

Do YOU Secure The SEPARATE TEXTS

for use with our WALKER'S CAESAR, JOHNSTON & KINGERY'S CICERO KNAPP'S VERGIL? With the paper texts for recitation purposes and these editions of the authors, you can *improve translation work*.

Without paper texts for recitation
half the *efficiency* of the book is lost.

Insist on your dealer supplying you with
these — one with each cloth-bound book *free*.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

623 South Wabash Ave., Chicago 37 East 28th St., New York

THE LATIN GAMES

Verb Games — 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, each 29c.

Game of Latin Authors, \$1.04.

Any or all sent postpaid on receipt of price. Stamps accepted.
Let the wide-awake sit down and order at once.

THE LATIN GAME CO. : : APPLETON, WIS.

By CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW

ESSENTIALS OF LATIN SYNTAX

90 CENTS

Admirably adapted for use as a review book with advanced classes in preparatory schools and with college freshmen. Part I furnishes a concise summary of syntax with references to the grammars of Allen and Greenough, West, and Bennett. Part II consists of two sets of exercises in composition, one from Caesar and the other from Livy.

ESSENTIALS OF GREEK SYNTAX

\$1.25

This volume is like "Essentials of Latin Syntax" in form and purpose. Grammar references are given to Goodwin, Hadley, Babbitt, and Goodell. The composition exercises are based on the "Anabasis" and on Lysias and Plato.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston
Atlanta

New York
Dallas

Chicago
Columbus

London
San Francisco

A SUPERB NEW TEXT

CICERO'S ORATIONS

Edited by
Walter B. Gunnison, Ph.D., Principal, and Walter
S. Harley, A. M., Instructor in Latin, Erasmus
Hall High School.

This is the most complete, most richly illustrated edition of Cicero ever published for school use. Many of its illustrations have never before appeared in a school text. It contains the required orations, all the Grammar, Prose Composition and Sight Reading Selections needed in third year work. 543 pp. \$1.25

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

231 West 39th Street

NEW YORK CITY